

## Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks below. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

A replacement abstract has been provided as requested by the Examiner.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 is moot in view of the cancellation of the corresponding claims.

Claims 1-4 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Moreau et al. (U.S. 7,260,776), hereafter “Moreau.” Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Moreau in view of Fry (U.S. 6,880,125). These rejections are defective because Moreau and Fry, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every feature of the claims as required by 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 103(a).

Regarding independent claim 1, Moreau fails to disclose, *inter alia*, “providing a reference tag table comprising a plurality of rows, each row comprising a first column containing a tag, a second column containing a set of one or more attributes corresponding to the tag in the first column, and a third column containing a name of a function associated with the tag in the first column, the function using a value of each of the attributes in the second column as a parameter when executed.” On the contrary, the schema document, which the Examiner has equated with the claimed reference tag table, comprises an XML document, not a table as claimed (see, e.g., Moreau, column

7).

Fry fails to remedy the glaring deficiencies of Moreau.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable.

With respect to the dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
/ John A. Merecki /

Dated: June 16, 2008

John A. Merecki  
Reg. No. 35,812

Hoffman Warnick LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, NY 12207  
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone  
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile